

REMARKS

The present response is in response to the Office Action, dated April 3, 2003, where the Examiner has *finally rejected* claims 1-32 pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-32 in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-20 and 21-31 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-20 and 22-31 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Giri et al. (USPN 6,261,467) ("Giri '467") in view of Naya (USPN 6,077,765) ("Naya '765"). Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that independent claims 1 and 17, from which claims 2-16 and 18-32 respectively depend are patentably distinguishable over the cited references of record, considered singly or in combination.

The present invention, as defined by independent claim 1, specifies a structure that includes, "a first conductor; a first isolation layer situated over said first conductor; a second conductor situated over said first isolation layer, said second conductor comprising under bump metal, said second conductor having at least one external pad, wherein said second conductor is connected to said first conductor; a second isolation layer situated over said second conductor." Significantly, independent claim 1 specifies that the second conductor comprises under bump metal.

In contrast, as noted by the Examiner in reference to Figure 1A of Giri '467, Giri '467 discloses that wiring layer 110 (identified by the Examiner as "second conductor 110") comprises a separate layer from joining pad layer 118 (identified by the Examiner as "under bump metal 118"). Thus, Giri '467 discloses that the second conductor is separate and distinct from the layer defining the under bump metal, which results in a structure which is a significant departure from that specified by independent claim 1.

The Examiner further acknowledges that Giri '467 fails to disclose that the second isolation layer is situated over joining pad layer 118 (identified by the Examiner as "under bump metal 118"), as specified by independent claim 1. However, the Examiner cites Naya '765 stating that Giri '467 could be modified by the disclosure of Naya '765 so that the second isolation layer is situated over joining pad layer 118. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the disclosures of Giri '467 and Naya '765 could not be combined as suggested by the Examiner because the suggested combination would render the structure in Giri '467 inoperable. Referring specifically to Figure 1A of Giri '467, the Examiner's suggested modification would result in passivation layer 112 covering joining pad layer 118, and would prevent element "C4" (solder) from electrically bonding to joining pad layer 118. Element "C4" would be isolated from joining pad layer 118 if the structure in Figure 1A were modified such that passivation layer 112 covers joining pad layer 118. Such a modification would prevent wiring layer 110 (situated below joining pad layer 118) from transmitting electrical signals, effectively rendering the structure inoperable. In sum, the combined references of Giri '467 and Naya '765 do not result in

the present invention as specified by independent claim 1. For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that rejection of independent claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims 2-16 has been traversed, and therefore, claims 1-16 should now be allowed.

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 17 for reasons similar to those discussed above in related to independent claim 1. For at least the same reasons discussed above, applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 17 and its corresponding claims 18-32 should also be allowed.

B. Rejection of Claims 5 and 21 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has further rejected claims dependent 5 and 21 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Giri '467 in view of Naya '765, as applied to claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-20 and 22-31, and further in view of Utsumi et al. (USPN 6,091,310) ("Utsumi '310"). As discussed above, the present invention, as defined by independent claims 1 and 17, is patentably distinguishable over Giri '467 and Naya '765, and, as such, claim 5 depending from independent claim 1 and claim 21 depending from independent claim 17 are, a fortiori, also patentably distinguishable over Giri '467 and Naya '765.

C. Rejection of Claims 16 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has further rejected dependent claims 16 and 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Giri '467 in view of Naya '765, and further in view of

Mourant (USPN 5,886,589) ("Mourant '589"). As discussed above, the present invention, as defined by independent claims 1 and 17, is patentably distinguishable over Giri '467 and Naya '765, and, as such, claim 16 depending from independent claim 1 and claim 32 depending from independent claim 17 are, a fortiori, also patentably distinguishable over Giri '467 and Naya '765.

D. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of claims 1-32 pending in the present application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned for any questions.

Respectfully Submitted,
FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP

Date: 6/3/03

Michael Farjami, Esq.
Reg. No. 38, 135

Michael Farjami, Esq.
FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP
16148 Sand Canyon
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 784-4600
Facsimile: (949) 784-4601

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit: 6/3/03

Lori Llave
Name of Person Mailing Paper and/or Fee

Loi Lane 6/3/03
Signature Date